





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS





*from the author*

# A REPLY

TO THE

## COMMITTEE OF THE PROMOTERS

OF THE

### Manchester and Salford Education Scheme,

WITH

## A P P E N D I X ;

CONTAINING :

- A. EXTRACT FROM REPORT OF THE BRISTOL CHURCH UNION.
- B. STATISTICS, ETC.
- C. REPLY TO MR. ENTWISLE.
- D. REPLY TO MR. RICHSON.
- E. CORRESPONDENCE WITH COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY.
- F. STATEMENT IN REFERENCE TO THE GIRDLESTONE CIRCULAR AND MEMORIAL.

BY

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON, M.A.,  
ARCHDEACON OF TAUNTON.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON :

JOSEPH MASTERS, ALDERSGATE STREET,  
AND NEW BOND STREET.

MANCHESTER : HALE AND ROWORTH ; SOWLER AND SON ; AND  
SIMMS AND DINHAM.

M D C C C L I .

LONDON :  
PRINTED BY JOSEPH MASTERS,  
ALDERSGATE STREET.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

It has been publicly avowed by the Authors and Promoters of the Manchester and Salford "Education" Scheme, that the scheme cannot succeed unless the Committee of the National Society shall consent to sacrifice their Rule, whereby all children who are scholars of Schools in Union with the Society, are required to be taught, and instructed in, the Catechism of the Church of England.\*

I wish to call the attention of these gentlemen to A FACT, which makes any such sacrifice, or even the formal consideration of it by the Committee of the National Society, SIMPLY IMPOSSIBLE.

The National Society, as incorporated by Royal Charter, is intituled "**THE NATORAL SOCIETY FOR PROMOTOG THE EDUCATION OF THE POOR IN THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ESTABLISHED CUCHCH, THROUGHOUT ENGLAND AND WALES."**"

Not a Society for any other kind, or manner, of

\* Mr. Entwistle's Apology for a Churchman's support of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill,—p. 13. Mr. Richson's "Sketch," &c.—pp. 32, 33, 54, 55, 68, 69.

“Education ;” not a Society for “ religious Education,” nor for “ Education generally ;” but specially and solely, a Society for “ Education in the principles of the Established Church.”

Now it is not only a “principle” of “the Established Church,” that all children in her schools shall be taught, and instructed in, the Catechism of the Church, but the Catechism is, itself, the exponent of “the principles” of the Church as applied to the Education of the young.\*

Wherefore the Committee of the National Society, in whom the government of the Society is vested by the Charter, *is not competent*—allowing, for argument’s sake, that *it were disposed*—to so much as entertain the formal consideration of the rescinding or setting aside, in any case whatsoever, the Rule in question; such Rule being simply the carrying out of one of the most manifest principles of the Church of England, in which principles, *and in none other*, the Committee is bound by the Charter to “promote the Education of the Poor.”

I beg to subjoin an extract from the preamble of the Charter, and to commend it respectfully to the consideration of those of my brethren who, being managers of schools in union with the National Society, may have allowed themselves, under the pressure of a so-called “necessity,” to depart in any measure or degree, from the rule in question. The preamble, in reciting the reasons for granting the Charter, says:—

“And whereas it has been represented to Us by the humble petition of the Most Reverend Father in God, our right trusty and right entirely beloved Councillor *Charles, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*, on behalf of

\* Vide Exhortation and direction to Sponsors, in office for “the ministration of public Baptism of Infants.”

himself as President, and of the Vice-Presidents and Committee of a certain Society, called ‘THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE EDUCATION OF THE POOR IN THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH THROUGHOUT ENGLAND AND WALES:’ that such Society has been established between four and five years; and that its sole object was originally declared to be ‘*to instruct and educate the Poor in suitable learning, works of industry, and the principles of the Christian Religion according to the Established Church:*’ That the Committee has ever since the foundation of the Society zealously and anxiously laboured to carry into effect the great designs which its Founders contemplated, *by Educating the Children of the Poor, WITHOUT ANY EXCEPTION,\* in the doctrine and discipline of the Established Church,* and in reading, writing, and ciphering, and (whenever it was practicable) in works of industry,’ &c. &c. &c.

\* It is difficult to account for the insertion of these words “**WITHOUT ANY EXCEPTION,**” unless upon the supposition, that the founders of the National Society foresaw that a time would come when the security which such words provide against any tampering with the primary purposes of the Society would be greatly needed. That such tampering process is, and has been, in actual operation, is evidenced by the subjoined extract from Mr. Richson’s “Sketch,” p. 55. “At the same Meeting, (i. e. a Meeting of the Committee of the Manchester Church Education Society,) the Committee also passed the following resolution, March 7, 1850. ‘That a Memorial be addressed to the Committee of the National Society, praying them to alter, or remodel, the terms of union, when requested by the managers of any Church School so to do, that parties, who have heretofore received the Society’s aid on those terms, may be enabled to conduct their schools in accordance with the *foregoing† resolution.*’ The memorial here alluded to, was addressed to the National Society, *but without any practical results.*”

† “That in all Church of England Schools, we feel it imperatively our duty to require, that the distinctive teaching of the Church of England should be fully maintained with respect to all those who are in her Communion;—BUT IT SHOULD IN NO SUCH SCHOOLS BE OBLIGATORY, THAT THE CHILDREN OF PARENTS, NOT BEING IN CHURCH OF ENGLAND COMMUNION, RECEIVE OTHER DIRECT RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION, THAN THAT INVOLVED IN THE DAILY READING OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.”

-I

—

## R E P L Y.

---

### TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE PROMOTERS OF THE MANCHESTER AND SALFORD EDUCATION BILL.

GENTLEMEN,—My attention has been called to a paper bearing date October 23, 1851, signed “by order of the Committee, C. H. Minchin, Acting Secretary,” and published in the *Manchester Courier* of Saturday, October 25th.

The purport of this paper is to remove any unfavourable impressions that may have been created by the remarks that I have felt it my duty to make upon the scheme of School Education for Manchester and Salford, which is now before the country.

But the paper, before proceeding to deal with the substance of my remarks, assumes that I have “misrepresented the facts of the case,” that I have “not met my opponents with fairness and candour, or in a spirit of Christian kindness,” that I have “indulged in imputations at variance with the spirit of charity which thinketh no evil.”

It is a pity that principles, and measures founded upon them, cannot be assailed and exposed without subjecting those, who dare not hesitate to assail and expose them, to the charge of wilful or ignorant misrepresentation, lack of candour, lack of kindness, lack of charity; that an assault upon principles and measures is immediately assumed to be an assault upon men.

I beg to assure the Committee, once for all, what indeed I had thought I had sufficiently stated in my published reply to the *Manchester Guardian* and to Mr. Entwistle, that the war which I

wage is one against all attempts to meet by way of an Education Rate the difficulties which press upon our great cities and towns in respect of School Education. I have no quarrel with any man, or set of men ; I fight for what I know to be “ the Truth,” and in doing this I do what is not simply consistent with, but a part of, the truest Charity ; *but I deny that I have either exaggerated, or misstated, or misrepresented, a single point ; and, before I have done, I think I can make the denial good.*

I will confess that it is not without great thankfulness that I find my challenge accepted, and this great controversy at length forced upon public notice. It was part of my plan to state the grounds of my assault with such nakedness and absence of all appearance of compromise, that the promoters of the scheme could hardly refuse to enter upon the discussion which is now before us ; but this is not to exaggerate, or misstate, or misrepresent. I have laboured for some years past to place the Education question before men’s minds in that prominence which is its true position : the introduction of the Manchester and Salford Scheme had brought matters to a point : I can plead guilty to nothing but to having seized the opportunity, and employed it for the purpose of bringing into the most startling juxtaposition principles which are incompatible in themselves, and which cannot therefore be really elements of the same scheme, however it may be possible, by means of an omission here, and a compromise there, to present them in that aspect before the multitude of men.

The Education question is the great question of the day,—especially is it so to all members of the Church Catholic. For the question of Church Synods, paramount as this is in importance, is rather a question as to the best and most legitimate method of dealing with all questions affecting the Church, than one of those questions themselves : the Church is as yet denied her plain and indefeasible right of assembling in Synod. Meantime the dangerous position of the Education, and other vital questions presses upon us in such sort that we must deal with them, by God’s help, as best we may.

Now I do not write in the hope of persuading the Committee any more than I apprehend the Committee write in the hope of persuading me ; we are so absolutely at issue upon the meaning

of the very word which is the subject matter of our controversy, the word "Education," that agreement between us is simply impossible.

The Committee, representing the promoters of this scheme, look to an Education

1. General,      2. Mixed,      3. Undogmatic,

as providing a remedy for the difficulties which press upon the whole population—Church and not Church—of the great cities and towns.

But Church Education—*if it is to continue Church Education*—must be

1. Particular,      2. Unmixed,      3. Dogmatic.

By "particular," as opposed to "general," I mean an Education founded, not upon the naked acceptance of the Bible but, upon "the Catholic Faith," "whole and undefiled," as read in, and proved by, Holy Scripture, and witnessed to in all ages by the Church Catholic.

By "unmixed," as opposed to "mixed," I mean an Education which does not attempt to train in the same school children of the Church and children not of the Church.

"Dogmatic," as opposed to "undogmatic," requires no explanation.

I have argued, and am prepared to maintain, that such an Education as this—and I know of no other deserving the name of Church Education—is impracticable in connection with an Education Rate, either local or general.

The Committee write to clear their scheme with the public from the supposed ill effects of my "misrepresentations." I write to persuade the public,—all who care for any fixity of belief—and especially Churchmen—to beware how they touch the Manchester and Salford Scheme, or indeed any scheme based upon an Education Rate, with so much as their little finger, except for the purpose of destroying it.

I use this language advisedly,—I am forced to speak plainly by the imminence of the peril. I am not insensible to the difficulties which press upon many anxious minds in respect of the wants and dangers of great populations like that of Manchester and Salford, but what I maintain is, *that the remedy suggested by the promoters of this scheme is worse than the disease.*

The scheme finds great numbers of children without school teaching,—it proposes to give school teaching to all. Will it leave one of those children established, *through its agency*, in the Catholic Faith of the Church of England? I cannot believe it. I see nothing in the scheme to make this probable, much less to guarantee it. *I see very much to make it more than probable that what will be taught under the scheme will be “religion” without distinctive doctrines; and in this I see nothing but a guarantee for infidelity.*

I trust therefore, very earnestly, that my brethren of Manchester and Salford will pause and reconsider the matter, lest they should, unawares, become active parties to a measure, which has, to some, a fair outside, but is not clean within; and that Churchmen generally will bestir themselves, for their own, and their children's sake, to supply the place of this scheme with the sound and wholesome agency of “Church Education.”

I proceed now to apply myself to the remarks and arguments of the paper of the Committee in their order.

I. I have stated, and am prepared to maintain, that the provision to be applied to all schools to be built out of the Rate, viz. that these shall be “without creeds,” “without formulae,” “without catechisms,”—and it must therefore, I fear, be added, “without prayers,”—is *the principle* of the Manchester and Salford scheme.

The Committee state that this is an “entire misrepresentation.” They explain that it is “only a provision against a very remote contingency, a contingency which, the promoters confidently believe, will seldom or never occur.”

If this be so, it is not easy to comprehend why the provision has been introduced at all. The popularity of the measure is not necessarily so great that the promoters of it can afford to invite odium. I don't understand this process of building walls for no other purpose than running one's head against them; it may be very chivalrous, but I doubt whether it be wise. But let us take *a fact, an argument, and a probability*, inherent in the reason of the thing and the nature of the case.

(a) The statistical returns printed in Appendix B. show that, so far from its being a correct account of the provision in ques-

tion, that it is “only a provision against a very remote contingency,” it must be brought into immediate application in the most necessitous districts of Manchester and Salford; that in a word, the Bill cannot effect what it proposes to effect upon any other terms:—the provision then is, not remote but, immediate, not exceptional but, normal. This is my *fact*.\*

(b) Even if the provision in question were remote and exceptional, this would not affect the fact of what is the principle of the measure; for the principle of a measure proposing to introduce a novelty into our social state,—such as is an Education Rate, must, in all reason, be estimated, not by that wherein it accommodates itself to what it finds but, by that which it super-adds, and wherein it is *altogether new*. This is my *argument*.

(c) It can hardly, I think, admit of a reasonable doubt that, when an Education Rate has once become law, and it is part of the enactment, that schools are not only to be *Maintained*, but may be *Built* out of the Rate, no schools will be *Built*, after a very few years, *except out of the Rate*,—that voluntary efforts will therefore in great measure, if not altogether, cease. Now, doubtless, the promoters of the Bill contemplate for it a lengthened existence and operation; ten years hence, the population of Manchester and Salford may be half a million, or even more—where are the schools to come from to meet the demand?—*Out of the Rate*. What then will be their character?—They will be “without Creeds,” “without formularies,” “without catechisms,” and as I said, I fear must be added, “without prayers.” This is my *probability*.

Is not the true account of the matter simply this—that there is so little *real* difference between the scheme of “the National Public School Association” and “the Manchester and Salford Scheme,” that the promoters of the latter have found it consistent with its general principle to introduce a provision into their measure, *without* which they could not have looked for the support, or even the acquiescence of the members of “the National Public School Association,”† but *with* which the two schemes become, for all purposes of practice, and indeed for all purposes

\* See Appendix B.

† Vide Mr. Entwistle’s “Apology,” p. 17, where he admits that the provision was introduced for this specific purpose.

of theory, in substance, if not in outward form, *purely identical* :—when a few years shall have rubbed off the varnish from the Manchester and Salford Scheme, the material and the texture of the two articles will be found to be precisely the same.

II. The process whereby the School Education of the entire country is sought to be gradually subjected to the control of the Committee of Council on “Education,” and the assistance which that laudable undertaking will derive from the Manchester and Salford Scheme, if it become law, requires some extended notice.

I have said :—

“The attempt to introduce into England the principle of an ‘Education’ Rate by means of a private Bill for Manchester and Salford, and, as an integral part of the scheme, to subordinate the entire School Education of the country, in the first instance for the poor and middle-classes, and ultimately for all classes, to the central supervision of the State, makes it a duty not simply to offer an active and uncompromising resistance to this attempt, but” &c. &c.

Upon this the Committee observe :—

“The impression here sought to be conveyed, and which will naturally be received from reading this passage, is that our plan will place all schools directly under the authority and supervision of the Committee of Council on Education, and that the admission of Government inspection is a necessary condition attached to the reception of aid under the Manchester and Salford Scheme : we know, moreover, that this impression has prevailed to a great extent.”

The Committee must excuse me. I beg to demur to this interpretation of my understanding and my motives. I am not so absolutely without information as to the real provisions of their measure, nor had I any wish to convey an incorrect impression. I did not mean what the Committee say I meant, and I had a good deal more in my mind when I wrote the sentence quoted above than appears to have entered into their calculation.

The Committee proceed to give their answer to what they assume to have been my meaning.

“But what is the truth? That while the measure adopts as

a matter of course, all schools already participating in the Parliamentary grant, and subject to Government inspection, it expressly provides for the support of other schools, which, if not at present in connexion with the Committee of Council on Education will not be required to become so under the local Bill.”\*

Of course these “other” (existing) “schools” will not be “*required*”—probably their Trust Deeds would make any such requirement nugatory—to place themselves in connexion with the Committee of Council on “Education.” But how this is an answer to what I have said, I am unable to understand : when I spoke of “The attempt to introduce,” &c. I was looking much beyond the promoters of the measure, and the measure itself—much beyond the limits of Manchester and Salford—existing circumstances and existing schools.

Let us look as briefly as possible at the real question before the country.

Now I suppose it will not be denied, either by the Committee of Council itself, or by those who think well of it, that, in their judgment, it would be an excellent and salutary thing, if it *did* exercise in behalf of the State a general control over the whole School education of the country ; at least, if this is not their judgment, it will be difficult to account for the past proceedings of that irresponsible, and in my belief, most dangerous, body.

Again, there is no room to doubt that a general “Education” Rate has been, all along, in the contemplation of those who have pulled the wires of the Committee of Council, as the *next step* to be taken with a view to the establishment of such general control.

I pass by private evidence in my possession. I take public facts.

1. The author of the Committee of Council on “Education” and prime agent in its work during the last ten years, is one of the principal promoters of, and subscribers to, the Manchester and Salford Scheme.

2. Four, at least, of Her Majesty’s Inspectors of Schools have in their Reports publicly advocated an “Education Rate,” and have indicated that the management of such a Rate will most

\* See Appendix D, under heads of Inspection and Appeal.

fitly be placed in the hands of the Committee of Council on "Education."

3. The promoters of the Manchester and Salford Scheme "set out with a full recognition of the benefits conferred by the Committee of Council on Education, and adopt in the main its principles of action, with such additions and modifications as local circumstances seem to require."\*

Thus there is a most intimate connexion between the promoters of the Manchester and Salford Scheme and the Committee of Council on "Education."

Now I have no wish to enter into any argument with those who have made up their minds that the Committee of Council on "Education" is a good agency. I can only deplore the fact for their own and others' sakes: but what I call the attention of Churchmen to is this:—

Here is the Committee of Council not concealing its desire for a general "Education" Rate, but rather parading it; and this with a view to the establishment of its own general supervision and control. Then comes *the first local experiment* in that direction, under the patronage of the Council office, and adopting and endorsing all its principles. Further still, it is quite idle to suppose that the experiment is to be confined to Manchester and Salford.

Is it then too much to say, notwithstanding the little fact, *which is made so much of, because it cannot be helped*, viz.—that *existing schools* will not be forced, in order to share in the support proposed to be derived from an "Education" Rate under the Bill, to connect themselves with the Committee of Council on "Education"—is it too much to say that we have before us an "attempt to introduce into England the principle of an Education Rate by means of a private Bill for Manchester and Salford, and to subordinate the entire School Education of the country to the central supervision of the State?" and what is the value of the answer which has been given to this allegation in the paper of the Committee?

Why, indeed, the promoters of the Manchester and Salford Scheme have taken what I have said in this particular so entirely to themselves, I do not understand. It was aimed, not at them

\* Letter of Committee, October 23, 1851.

but, at the Committee of Council on "Education," in whose hands the promoters have placed themselves and their scheme; I suspect without being well aware of what will be the issue, if the attempt of the Committee of Council succeed, both as affecting Manchester and Salford, and the country at large.

It is very curious to remark, in connection with this particular portion of the subject, that there is so very little general apprehension of what are, however, two undoubted facts:—1. That the Committee of Council on "Education" are the originators of the idea of an "Education" Rate. 2. That they are the parties chiefly interested in its success—that meetings are held here and there, and speeches made, in which the system of the Committee of Council is represented as being placed in jeopardy by the probable success of the proposal for an "Education" Rate; and some of Her Majesty's Inspectors, who, by a process of reasoning, which is to me unintelligible, have arrived at the conclusion, that the system of the Committee of Council may be worked favourably for the Church, are moving *against* an "Education" Rate, while their patrons in Downing Street are moving *for* it.

III. Under this head the Committee have themselves supplied me with the answer to their own defence.

I have said that the Manchester and Salford Scheme is one which "*prefers* that Church children and children of all denominations should be jumbled together in the same school."

I say so still. Now let us see what the Committee say.

1st. They assert that the *great object and principle* of the measure is the enabling each separate "'denomination'—*the Church of England is then, it seems, a 'denomination,' one of many, with the Committee*,—to conduct its own particular school without interference with the discipline, management, or instruction."

This is a curious account of the "*great object and principle*" of a measure, the promoters of which have formally expressed their hope that the National Society, as representing the Church of England, will see fit to modify the rule whereby all children of schools in connection with the Society are required to learn the Church Catechism. Indeed in Mr. Entwistle's "Apology for a Churchman's support of the Manchester and Salford Educa-

tion Bill," he goes much further and tells us something which I am very glad to know, e. g., "it would not be too much to say, that from the vast number of schools which have received the Society's aid, and are therefore bound by their terms, the Bill which we promote *would be a failure* without their (i. e. the Society's) concurrence," IN OTHER WORDS, WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE SOCIETY TO ABANDON THE RULE OF THE CHURCH, WHEREBY EVERY CHILD WHO IS A SCHOLAR OF A CHURCH SCHOOL IS REQUIRED TO LEARN THE CATECHISM OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. Now is there any conceivable reason for the expression of the hope above referred to, except the fact that those who express it desire to see Church schools thrown open to children of "other denominations," EVEN AT THE EXPENSE OF THE CHURCH'S RULE; and is this anything else than to "*prefer* that the children of the Church and children of all denominations should be jumbled together in the same school?"

2nd. The Committee allow that "in order to meet the possible case of children of one denomination attending the school of another *it is provided*"—what is provided? Hear, ye ministers and people of the Church of England, and see what it is proposed that *the schools of the Church* shall become in the golden age of the "Education" Rate.

IT IS PROVIDED THAT NO CHILD SHALL BE REQUIRED TO LEARN ANY DISTINCTIVE RELIGIOUS CREED, CATECHISM, OR FORMULARY, TO WHICH THE PARENTS OR THOSE HAVING THE CARE AND MAINTENANCE OF SUCH CHILD SHALL, IN WRITING, OBJECT.

And then the Committee are bold to say that this provision is an exception to a general rule, and made to meet special cases. What general rule? Why, if every child in every school was to be made a "special case,"—what is to hinder it?—the "general rule" would, I suppose, disappear speedily under the operation of a very few "special cases."

The simple truth is that *one* such "special case" in a school is fatal to the character of that school as a "Church school." If the Committee are not aware of this fact, I must take leave to bring it under their notice.

IV. The Committee labour to convict me of inconsistency in

having proposed in my “outline of a plan for combining State assistance with the safety of Church Education,” to derive assistance from the Exchequer to Church schools, upon a principle common to them and to the schools of the “denominations,” and then assailing the Manchester and Salford scheme, which is built upon an “Education” Rate.

“Argumenta ad hominem” of this nature are always a sign of weakness. If I could be convicted of the inconsistency supposed, it would not improve the case of the Committee. The truth does not stand or fall with *me*.

But there is no inconsistency at all. The Committee appear to argue in this way.

If a citizen may pay taxes, without feeling his conscience aggrieved, part of which taxes may be applied by Government to Educational purposes which he cannot approve, he ought, upon the same principle, not to be aggrieved at paying an “Education” Rate.

In the minor premiss of this notable syllogism it is assumed that an “Education” Rate and the taxes are things of the same nature.

It is concluded therefore that what makes the mind easy under the payment of the one ought to make the mind easy under the payment of the other.

I deny the minor premiss, and, by consequence, the conclusion.

An Education Rate is not a thing of the same nature with the taxes.

1st. Because the taxes are contributed for *general*, and in many respects *previously unascertained*, purposes, and their proceeds placed at the disposal of the governing power, *who are responsible for the use they make of them, and not the parties paying them*.

And it is obvious that if it were a legitimate ground of objection to a tax, that its proceeds, or any part of them, might afterwards be applied to purposes which the payer could not approve, there must be an end of taxation at once, and, therein, of national existence.

2nd. An Education Rate is contributed for a *particular* and *previously ascertained* purpose.

And it is equally obvious here, as in the opposite case, that an "Education" Rate is *not necessary* to national existence.

Wherefore the two things are not of the same nature.

But indeed, even if they were of the same nature, this fact would not help the Committee as against me.

For the *real* question is, not how the money is raised, or through what channel it finds its way, but on what principle it is applied.

Now money grants from the Exchequer *in aid* of voluntary efforts may very well and very easily,—*notwithstanding our experience of the Committee of Council on Education*,—be applied upon a principle involving no interference upon the part of the civil power with the matter and the manner of the teaching held to be essential by the parties assisted.

But it must, I think, be obvious that when schools come to be *maintained*, or both *built* and *maintained*, out of an Education Rate, such freedom from interference on the part of the civil authorities, either local or general, is no longer possible.

I argue thus :—

1. *A priori*, from the theory of Rating.
2. *A posteriori*, from the fact that the promoters of the Manchester and Salford scheme have not been able to avoid the interference.

1. *A priori*.

What is the theory of a rate? The theory of a rate is that citizens be assessed, locally or generally, as the case may be, for purposes which are—

- (1.) Of confessed public benefit.
- (2.) Such as, if men differ about the manner of carrying them out, the minority may be expected to give way to the majority without putting any strain upon their conscience.

For example, it is *a confessed public benefit* to pave and light the streets of a town, and those of the inhabitants who prefer to walk in the mud, or to grope their way in the dark, need not be considered. And if the ratepayers differ about *the manner* of lighting and paving, the minority may very fairly be expected to yield to the majority, without putting any strain upon their conscience. But Education is not a thing, as logicians speak, "*in pari materia*." We may assume, indeed, that it is *a confessed public benefit* to educate a people. No one will dispute

that proposition. But when we come to what is meant by Education, i. e. to *the matter and manner* of Education, the differences are so great, *and run up so completely into first principles*, that the minority cannot be expected to give way to the majority, because this would involve a direct strain upon the conscience. It is right and good, then, to make a rate for paving and lighting a town, or for any analogous purpose ; but, as for making a rate to educate people, that is neither right nor good, nor, strictly speaking, is it possible, without reducing Education to the level of vague general instruction. That it shall never be reduced to this level is just what the Churchman has to contend for at all costs and risks. Now the majority of men take a loose and low view of what is meant by Education. They confine it principally to the wants of this life, and reject, as an abstraction, the idea that it must be based upon definite revealed truths ; upon the “one Faith” committed by God to the keeping of His Church ; and as the minority will no more—and indeed can no more—concede these points than the majority will adopt them, the difference between the two is one which must always subsist. Now, a rate, and the manner of spending a rate, is the expression of the will of a majority,—an expression certainly not, under the present circumstances of the world, in accordance with the mind of the Church, but in reality, however it may be disguised, setting aside her mission and her office, and weakening her hands for the discharge of her trust. I conclude, therefore, à priori, that an Education Rate, is a thing neither right nor good under any conceivable circumstances of our present state, and I have such confidence in the soundness of the argument whereby I have arrived at this conclusion, that I will add “*Quod erat demonstrandum.*”

Some persons, however, appear to take it for granted that, in one shape or another, we must be prepared to see an “Education Rate” here in, England. Their judgment is, I suppose, that such a Rate *can be made safe*. Indeed if any Churchman advocates, or acquiesces in, the proposal for an “Education Rate” upon any ground *short of this*, that man will, I hope, not be offended, if I say that it is just this disposition to give way before every “presumed necessity” which makes it so difficult to maintain any Church principle.

Now I say that an “ Education Rate ” *cannot be made safe*. I say more, I say it is *simply impracticable*.\* And I would submit that it can hardly have been sufficiently considered what the *local* working of an “ Education Rate ” would be.—I append what follows by way of illustration of my argument *à priori*.

People who pay a RATE expect an equivalent in a tangible shape, one of which they shall experience the *local* advantage. This is quite inseparable from the idea of payment to a RATE, though it is not inseparable from the idea of payment to the general TAXES.

Suppose then the “ Education Rate ” assessed, and collected in a parish which numbers among its rated inhabitants—as is by no means an uncommon case even in country parishes—

Church of England members,  
Roman Catholics,  
Wesleyans,  
Independents,  
Baptists, &c., &c., &c.,  
and

People who like what are called “ purely secular ” schools,—

and which at present contains the Parish School in connection with the Parish Church, a Roman Catholic School, and, perhaps one or more, perhaps none—in connection with the sects—and, as yet, no school of the “ purely secular ” kind.

One of *three* things must happen.

(1.) Either all who pay the Rate will expect to be accommodated in the “existing schools, AND MOST OF ALL IN THE CHURCH SCHOOL, AT THE EXPENSE OF THE CHURCH’S RULES OF DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE.”†

\* Except indeed in connexion with a “PURELY SECULAR” system of “Education.”

† The subjoined extract from the recent charge of the Bishop of Manchester presents in a curious, though by no means novel, aspect the Bishop’s estimate of the manner in which it becomes the managers of CHURCH schools to discharge *their responsible office, and their duty towards the children of the Church*.

“Thus, while I never would consent to give up the use of the Catechism, the Prayer Book, and the distinctive teaching of the Church of England in our Church schools, *I would restrict their use to particular periods of the week*, at which I would permit the child of the dissenter, at his own and his parents’ peril, to absent himself. I would compel him to stand respectfully at the reli-

(2.) Or a separate school must be established in each separate place, or within reasonable distance, for each separate form of opinion, however few the Ratepayers may be who require it.

(3.) Or the Ratepayers must be left to pay their rate, and, many of them, to complain that they get no equivalent.

No. 1. Is destructive to Religion.

No. 2. Is impossible.

No. 3. Would do exceeding mischief, in creating and perpetuating a grievance; and is besides, directly opposed to the principle upon which an “Education Rate” is advocated; viz. that *every* Ratepayer should receive an equivalent for his Rate.

But no injury to religion, and no grievance is involved in receiving *aid* from the Exchequer; provided always that such aid carry with it no interference, and no attempt upon the part of the State to intrude a system of its own into the place of those it professes to encourage and support.

2. The argument, *à posteriori*, stands upon the fact that the promoters of the Manchester and Salford Scheme have not been able to avoid the interference in question. For whether the

gious services of the school, where he is allowed to go, and where he is prayed for, if unable to join in it; and the like I would require from all dissenting schools assisted by the rate. No liberty of conscience would thus be violated—no unjust restraint imposed.”

It seems then, that this Bishop of THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND is content to see—nay, that he *recommends*—indirect contravention of the Charter of the National Society, that the children of the Church be robbed of that *daily* training in the doctrine of the Church of England which is *their right*, and which the Clergy of the Church of England have expressly *in trust* to give them—the result of which must *necessarily be* that the value and *practical application* of dogmatic teaching of THE FAITH, and its necessary bearing upon the daily life and conversation will be depreciated in the eyes of the children of THE CHURCH—that he is content to see, nay, that he *recommends*, such a course as this, *for the sake of giving a “general Education” to children who are not of THE CHURCH.*

The latter part of the above extract, as also that which follows, will hardly tend to increase the number of the Bishop's many-coloured partisans in Manchester and Salford.

“ But let us recollect that schools supported wholly out of the rates, if they ever do exist, could only exist in districts where no one could be persuaded to set up a school of any denomination; although, certainly, the schools would be assisted by the payments of all willing to resort to them. *Were there such a district, I should unquestionably claim a school, built in it and supported from the rates, for the Established Church, subject always to the same conditions as the others.*”

problem of avoiding all such interference in connection with an “Education” Rate, be capable of being solved or not, it is at least quite clear that the promoters of the Manchester and Salford Scheme have not solved it: they have not so much as attempted to solve it by any provisions of their proposed Bill.

I am bound to believe that those of them who are Churchmen have attempted the solution before they drew their Bill. I regret that, having found the solution impracticable, they should have cut the knot with an unlawful weapon.

For their scheme advocates, with respect to existing schools, that the teaching of the Catechism be not rigidly observed; and, with respect to schools to be built out of the Rate, i.e., I believe with respect to *all schools to be built hereafter*, the scheme advocates that these should be without any Catechism at all. If this be not to interfere with Church teaching, I do not know what interference is.

V. I have but one point more to touch, for the writer of the article in the *English Churchman*, for which I am not responsible, will doubtless take very good care of himself. I will only say that I am quite of his mind.

The remaining point brings out, more clearly, perhaps, and conclusively than any other, the absolute difference in point of principle between the Committee and myself.

The Committee infer that, in objecting to their measure that it is “upon the plan of all persons contributing alike for the dissemination of what they believe to be true and what they believe to be false,” I am not of course alluding to “the Rate built schools, because it could not for an instant be contended that the religious instruction prescribed in them—that is, the daily reading of the Holy Scriptures—could, in any sense, be termed the dissemination of what any body of professing Christians believed to be false.”

This is a curious piece of reasoning; as I think, a transparent fallacy; but it may be worth while to point out wherein the fallacy consists.

There are two kinds of false teaching.

1. The teaching what is in itself false.
2. The teaching what is in itself true in a false way.

In their reply to my objection the Committee have taken only the first of these two kinds of false teaching; whereas in my objection I had taken *both alike*.

The Committee must then excuse my declining to accept a reply, which, if it be a reply at all, can only be so by being conveyed in a syllogism which has *four terms*.

And they must allow me to tell them, in all kindness, that to ask Churchmen to contribute to a Rate out of which it is proposed to provide schools wherein “religious instruction” is to be cared for by means of the bare reading of the Holy Scriptures, is to ask Churchmen to contribute to a Rate “for the dissemination alike of what they must believe to be true and what they must believe to be false.”

VI. I have now put in a rejoinder to all the points raised by the Committee in their reply to myself. I have confined myself strictly to these points, being desirous to keep the controversy as clear and distinct as possible.

I beg to assure the Committee of my great regret at finding myself thus absolutely at variance with many of my brethren with whom I would most gladly and thankfully have found myself co-operating in the great cause of educating the people. But as it is, I am compelled, in the Church’s cause, and for the people’s sake, to do my utmost—everything that I lawfully may—to overthrow their scheme.

In conclusion I will set down again here the same challenge which I published in the advertisement to my two sermons, and to which—I say it with all respect for Mr. Entwistle—*no answer has yet been given*.

“I challenge the authors and promoters of this notable project to escape from the dilemma following: Either the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the schools to be built out of the Rate must be *without* any teaching of doctrine, in which case God’s Book is abused and desecrated—desecrated because employed as a common lesson book—abused because it is revealed in the Book itself that it is the office of the Church to interpret and expound the Scriptures—or it must be *with* such teaching, in which case creeds, formularies, and Catechisms, *in one shape or another*, are at once made a part of the teaching of the schools.”

Mr. Entwistle appears to think that an escape from this

dilemma is to be found by referring me to “one example of teaching in the Holy Scriptures,” out of which he challenges me to “make an extract which shall justify my assertion that teaching and ‘doctrine’—in the sense in which we both accept the word for the purposes of our argument\*—are inseparable.”

I will make no “extract,” for the simple reason that I wish to quote the *whole* Sermon on the Mount, and not any *part of it* separately, in justification of my assertion that “teaching and doctrine are inseparable.”

In Mr. Entwistle’s proposed schools it is very possible, nay, it is very probable, that a child, who has been baptized into the Church Catholic, may stand side by side in a class with the child of an Unitarian or Socinian.

May I ask Mr. Entwistle a simple question? If he were teaching that class, giving it “religious” instruction in connection with any part of the Sermon on the Mount, how would he deal with the question of the Person† and the Authority‡ of the Preacher? If he taught explicitly that both were Divine, he would not teach Unitarianism or Socinianism,—if he did not teach explicitly that both were Divine, he would not teach Christianity.

I have the honour to be,

Gentlemen,

Your obedient, faithful Servant,

EAST BRENT,

GEORGE A. DENISON.

*S. Simon and S. Jude*, 1851.

\* i.e. “the teaching of those tenets or Articles of Faith which are held as distinguishing one congregation of Christians from another.”—Mr. Entwistle’s letter.

† Compare S. Matt. vii. 21—23.

‡ Compare S. Matt. v. 18, 20, 22, 26, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44; vi. 2, 5, 16, 25; vii. 28, 29.

## APPENDIX.

---

### A.

“OBJECTIONS TO AND REMARKS UPON THE MANCHESTER AND SALFORD ‘EDUCATION SCHEME;’” reprinted from the Annual Report of the Bristol Church Union, April 7th, 1851.

*The argument under heads I. II. III. of this paper is to be taken as proceeding simply upon the Parliamentary ground of “religious liberty.”*

“I. Basis of the Bill inconsistent with ‘religious liberty.’

“1. An ‘Education rate’ is a thing hitherto unheard of in this country, and cannot be reconciled by any arguments, however plausibly put, with our institutions, and habits and modes of thought.

“2. An ‘Education rate’ cannot be reconciled with ‘religious liberty’—because the meaning of ‘religious liberty’ is that each religious body be free to *carry out* its own *religious* system, and to do its own work in its own way—without being subjected to the control of any other religious body, and without interference, direct or indirect, on the part of the civil power.

“Now an ‘Education rate’ is a compulsory contribution by all rate-payers towards the support of a system—however impossible it may be to reconcile such system, either in its principle, or in its details, with the power of *carrying out* by the several sets of rate-payers their own *religious* systems, respectively, and of doing their own work in their own way.

“3. It is no answer to say—as Mr. Entwistle puts it, vaguely enough, (Remarks, page 8,)—that rate payers may, ‘in such a modified form as the general principles of the scheme require,’ apply their rate to certain particular schools—(iii. 7, 8, draft of Bill)—because the Bill proposes, iii. 8, that ‘if, in any case, the amount of rate so required to be appropriated to any class of Schools, as aforesaid, shall exceed the amount of aid required by such Schools, under the provisions of this Act, the Municipal Council shall apply such surplus to the *general purposes* of this Act, as if such special appropriation had not been made.’”

"So that, after all, it is quite possible, and very probable, that some part of every Churchman's rate may go towards the support of Schools, in which teaching is given and principles inculcated, which, as Churchmen, they are bound, *not only not to support, but to condemn.*

"And even if every farthing of rate imposed upon Churchmen under this Bill could only be applied, under any circumstances, to the support of Church Schools—which is not at all what is contemplated by the Bill—it would *all the same* be an invasion of the 'religious liberty' of Churchmen to force them to be parties, *in any shape*, to a system, of which the principle is inconsistent with the order and the practice of the Church: to *rate people at all* for the support of a system, notwithstanding that, upon their own principles, they *must* disapprove of the principle of such system, under whatever modifications it may be presented, is a direct invasion of their 'religious liberty' and of the 'rights of conscience.'

"4. Thus the basis of the whole scheme—an 'Education Rate'—cannot be made to consist with that which its promoters confess is essential to its 'success'—respect for 'religious liberty.'

"5. There is no analogy to be drawn from Church rates for obvious reasons—and, if there were, it is not an argument of which the promoters of this scheme would, probably, avail themselves.

#### *"II. Principle of the Bill inconsistent with 'religious liberty.'*

"I. This is altogether *one sided*—it *encourages* everything that is lax and loose—it *discourages* everything that is definite and precise. Here again then the Bill is inconsistent with respect for 'religious liberty'—because it is plain that there are those of us—that is, all Churchmen—whose 'religious liberty' is of a definite and precise character—that is, defined by the Church herself. Now the Bill deals with all *such* 'religious liberty' not as a thing to be fostered and encouraged, nor indeed even as a thing to be *protected*—but simply as an *unfortunate fact*, and as one which ought to be made to disappear as quickly as may be.

"2. The Principle of the Bill may be shortly described as an attempt to exalt the 'advantages' of a General Scheme of 'Education,' at the expense of the teaching of the Catholic Faith, and the training of our children in the principles of the Church of England.

"Thus all schools based upon the principle of dogmatic teaching, whether belonging to the Church of England or not, are at once and necessarily '*vi terminorum*' placed by the Bill at a disadvantage.

#### *"III. Provisions of the Bill inconsistent with 'religious liberty.'*

"1. They *exclude* all schools which are not in connection with, or which shall not connect themselves with, the Committee of Council on Education, from all 'benefit.'\* Now such connection is one which many Churchmen hold to be inadmissible, on the ground that it carries with it a departure from the order and the practice of the Church of England, and

\* It has since been stated that this is not one of the *formal* provisions of the Bill. But see Appendix D, under heads of Inspection and Appeal.

involves that most dangerous distinction between ‘religious and secular instruction,’ with various other objectionable principles, which have, during the last few years, been so fully discussed in detail, that it is not necessary to enter upon them here.

“The Bill, on the other hand, *assumes* that such connection with the Committee of Council on Education is a matter both of *necessity* and *right*. Thus it is plainly intended to operate ‘unostentatiously’ for the purpose of bringing *all* the Schools of Manchester and Salford within the influence, and under the supervision, of the Committee of Council on Education.

“2. The appeal lies *in no case* to the Bishop of the Diocese—but *always* to the Committee of Council on Education. This is another contravention of the ‘religious liberty’ of Churchmen.

“3. The attendance of children of persons receiving out-door relief is to be *compulsory*. Now such compulsory attendance of pauper children, with any provisions tending thereto, is most objectionable—because

“1. It is an exercise of power which amounts to *tyranny over the poor*, and to a practical denial of their ‘religious liberty.’

“2. It is degrading to the objects of it, and inflicts a stigma upon them as a class.

“3. It is just what is most calculated to make the whole class indifferent to having their children at school at all.

“4. It is a step to a *general compulsion*, and to the introduction of the system which has borne such evil fruit on the Continent of Europe.

“IV. Some other principal objections to the *Provisions of the Bill* are—

“1. That the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the school as a safeguard against what is called ‘purely Secular Education,’ is *a delusion*. It is, besides, to use the Holy Scriptures in a way that does them *great dishonour*—that is, as a mere school reading book. And—what is matter of gravest consideration for all Churchmen—it is to use them in a way which *absolutely ignores the Office and Commission of the Church as ‘the witness and the keeper of Holy Writ.’*

2. That the Bill *must* discourage voluntary efforts—because it proposes to confine these in future to the carrying out the details of the Bill more largely and effectually.

“3. That the Bill is only a step towards the plan of the ‘National Public School Association,’ and can only be accepted by that body in that view.

“4. That the ‘success’ of the plan detailed in the Bill is impossible, *unless at the expense of the principle of the National Society*.—Mr. Entwistle, p. 12.

“5. Allowing (for argument’s sake) that there is *any* advantage in the plan—there is plainly *no* advantage which might not be much better and more safely attained by the return of the Committee of Council on Education to the simple principle of the agreement of 1840.

*"Remarks.*

"V. With reference to what Mr. Entwistle calls, p. 13, 'the peculiar principle of the scheme,' namely, 'the allowing the Parents or Guardians to select the School where the religious instruction is in accordance with their own *opinions*, and the appropriating payment out of the rate to each School at an equal rate per head on every child registered as attending regularly at such School.'

"It is be observed—

"That it is a complete and palpable delusion to speak of the 'impartiality and equity' of such principle.

"Because—to say nothing of what has been disposed of above—namely, that the *entire scheme is one-sided*, in favour of latitudinarianism, and of dealing with differences touching the great doctrines of Christianity as only 'shades of opinion,' p. 14, it is obvious that the working of the scheme may, *at any time*, and probably will *at all times*, apply a portion of every man's rate to the dissemination of doctrines contrary to his belief, and to the inculcation of principles repulsive to his conscience.

"And even if this *partial and inequitable* principle of the Bill did not, *at first*, betray itself in the practical arrangements of any particular locality, the objection would still lie in full force—that it *is* the principle of the Bill : is liable to be called into active operation *at any moment*, and is intended to be called into active operation *whenever there is any opportunity*.

"VI. It would seem difficult to devise any more certain and effectual way of perpetuating and propagating heresies and schisms under the plea of 'free education,' than the passing and carrying out of this Bill.

"VII. Not to oppose vigorously and steadily, and much more to be a party in any shape to, a scheme of this description, appears, for all the above reasons, to be inconsistent with the plain duty of Churchmen—not to say with the duty of *all* who, though not of the Communion of the Church of England, make *any Profession of Faith.*"

## B.

The subjoined statistics, the accuracy of which will, I believe, not be disputed, go far to establish some important facts in connection with the proposed "Education" Rate for Manchester and Salford.

1. That school accommodation is very unequally distributed among the several ecclesiastical districts.

2. That the want of such accommodation is greatest in the most populous and the poorest districts.\*

3. That the scholars attending existing Sunday schools, whose number is a very sufficient test of the number among the poorer classes who will take advantage of school teaching, amount to some thousands more than one-sixth of the entire population, which is the proportion of the community for which it is assumed, both by the Promoters of the National Public School Association, and of the Manchester and Salford Scheme, that school accommodation ought to be provided.

4. That therefore there is no ground to expect that the number of scholars will be increased under the Bill, *unless provisions are resorted to, to make attendance compulsory.*

\* 1, 2, are illustrated by a map of Manchester and Salford lying before me, in which the ecclesiastical districts, 35 in number, 27 in Manchester and 8 in Salford, are coloured.

1st class. Yellow.

2nd " Red.

3rd " Black.

*Yellow* represents those districts in which ample accommodation or more than sufficient, exists.

*Red* those in which the accommodation is about equal to the amount assumed to be required.

*Black* those in which there is a decided deficiency, so as to make the building of new schools *out of the Rate* imperative, if adequate accommodation is to be provided.

In the borough of Manchester 12 districts are coloured *Black*, in Salford 3; and it appears further, that the operation of the Bill will be to close so many of the existing schools in three other districts of Manchester, and one of Salford, that these will have to be coloured black also.

That is, there will be, under the operation of the Bill, in all 19 districts out of 35, in which it will be necessary to build new schools *out of the Rate.*

*Statistics of the various Day and Sunday Schools in the Municipal Borough of Manchester, 1851*

Name of Ecclesiastical District.	No. of Day Scholars in connection with Sunday Schools.		Schools unconnected with any religious body.					Day Schools connected with religious bodies, but not with Sunday Schools.		Sunday Schools.		Sum Total of scholars attending Day and Sunday Schools.		No. requiring Education, i.e. one-sixth of the population.	Total population of each District.	
	Ch.	Dis.	1	2	3	4	5	Ch.	Dis.	Church	Dissent					
S. Mary's .							14			200		214	694	4,165		
S. Matthew's	207	120	8	65	68	78				400	410	1,029	2,116	12,701		
S. John's .	365	525	25	206	90	67		106		600	2,641	3,735	2,386	14,319		
S. Peter's .					25					270	28	1,023	195	1,166		
Cathedral* .	314	545	108	288	221	43	400	60		590	1,749	3,459	3,871	23,225		
S. Luke's* .			40							90		130	199	1,195		
S. Mark's* .	263									320		320	673	4,039		
S. Ann's .	275									475		475	351	2,104		
S. Paul's .	130		130	108	12	113				354	927	1,644	1,360	8,161		
S. James' .	180	150		90		49				490	1,212	1,841	994	5,962		
S. Michael's .	357	466		30	156	29				850	1,766	2,831	3,640	21,840		
S. George's .	530	1923	18	356	284	136				3,700	4,930	9,424	5,702	34,215		
S. Thomas .	282		6	70	45	24				360	100	605	1,204	7,223		
S. Simon and S. Jude .	320	350				24				598	1,036	1,658	825	4,949		
S. Barnabas .	380				204	103				380		687	1,409	8,453		
Harpurhey .	34	123				40				{ 231 } { 269 }	825	{ 1,096 } { 269 }	454	2,717		
S. Philip's .			65				140			182	247	569	865	5,191		
S. Andrew's .	220	92	20	778			254			600	615	2,267	2,801	16,802		
S. Jude's .	196	497		176			227			466	1,407	2,276	2,292	13,753		
All Souls .	214	132		148			155			253	412	968	1,597	9,585		
S. Thomas' .	231		200	112		153				395	289	1,149	1,197	7,183		
S. Silas' .	200	20		20		249				601	1,124	1,994	1,432	8,593		
All Saints .	240	725	486	228	465	187				460	3,217	5,043	4,771	28,628		
S. Saviour's .	486		397	87	15	30				486	1,194	2,507	1,153	6,918		
S. George's .	220	797	186	543	505	262		110		800	2,644	5,050	4,690	28,141		
S. Mark's .	47			38	123	40				180		381	1,045	6,274		
Holy Trinity	350	270	63	52	262	366				476	769	1,988	3,176	19,055		
	6041	6300	1687	3395	2475	2782	1100		276	298	15,076	27,542	54,631	51,092	306,557	
		276	298			11,439						42,618				

1. The number of children will be found to agree in the aggregate with the Police returns made to the Watch Committee, and is further corroborated by the numbers returned as attending the Peel Park demonstration.

2. The population of the ecclesiastical districts is taken from the Registrar's return at the late Census.

3. The quality of education is thus expressed: 1. First class. 2. Second class. 3. Poor or Charitable Schools. 4. Dame, or Infant Schools. 5. Public Schools, i.e., Grammar School, 400; Mechanics' Institution School, 700.

\* A portion of the Cathedral district, with S. Mark's and S. Luke's, form the Township of Cheetham. Owing to the Cathedral district including a large part of Cheetham, it is necessary to place these districts together.

Township of Manchester.

Township of Townships of Ardwick, Chorlton-on-Medlock.

of Hulme.

The school statistics of Salford present the same result.

Name.	Church Schools.		Dissent.		Secu- lar.	Total.	One- sixth.	Total Popula- tion.
	Day.	Sun.	Day.	Sun.				
S. Philip's . . .	490	340	459	1539	52	2081	1732	10,392
Trinity . . .		225	515	1340	116	1681	2081	12,486
Christ Church . .	728	791	300	1121		1912	1169	7,013
S. Bartholomew . .	425	400	90	247		647	1384	8,286
S. Stephen . . .	286	450	190	1050	152	1652	1646	9,888
S. Matthias . . .	245	350	40	600	215	1165	864	5,186
S. Simon . . .		370	290	420		790	1015	6,093
	2174	2926	1884	6317	535	9928	9888	59,344

There appears to be every reason to conclude that the whole of the 3rd and 4th class schools will be closed by the operation of the Bill, and a large proportion of class 2.

*Total number of children in general attendance in Sunday Schools at Manchester and Salford, January to June, 1851.*

	Manchester.	Salford.	Total.
Church of England . . . . .	15,438	2,926	18,364
Wesleyans . . . . .	5,384	1,928	7,312
Independents . . . . .	4,110	2,267	6,377
Roman Catholics . . . . .	4,275	700	4,975
Association Methodists . . . . .	2,355		2,355
Unitarians . . . . .	1,390		1,390
Presbyterians . . . . .	1,277	120	1,397
Lancasterians . . . . .	1,200		1,200
Baptists . . . . .	1,060	466	1,526
New Connexion Methodists . . . . .	1,092		1,092
Primitive Methodists . . . . .	963	160	1,123
Bible Christians . . . . .	649		649
Welsh Calvinists, &c. . . . .	435		435
New Jerusalem . . . . .	200	70	270
Friends . . . . .	210		210
Jews . . . . .	35		35
Various Bodies of Methodists, &c. . . . .	2,225	606	2,831
Schools of which the denomination is not given . . . . .	490		490
	42,788	9,243	52,031

In 1851, the population of the municipal boroughs of Manchester and Salford amounted to 365,901, according to the returns of the Registrar General, in the various ecclesiastical districts. And assuming this to be

correct, we have 60,983, as one-sixth of the population, which being between the ages of three and fifteen, ought to be under education. As this is the ground on which both the rival schemes are founded, we will admit its correctness for the purposes of argument, though it is manifest that many children of such tender years could not attend a school.

A careful investigation of the state of education in these boroughs, during the past year shows the following result:—

Manchester.—Number attending Sunday schools or day

schools connected with religious bodies	43,192
First class day schools <i>only</i>	1,687
Second class ditto	3,395
Poor or charitable ditto	2,475
Dame or infant ditto	2,782
Public schools	1,100

Salford. — Number attending Sunday schools or day

schools connected with religious bodies	9,243
Day schools only	535
Making a total of	64,409

These numbers are given merely to show that the statement that there is sufficient school accommodation without the erection of fresh buildings, has much the appearance of truth; but it would be manifestly unfair in so large a population, not to look more narrowly into the statistics of the locality before we admit this assertion.

The point before us is—the rival schemes agree in assessing one-sixth as the proportion of the population which ought to be under instruction—and as both their measures are designed to supply certain alleged wants, we may conclude that they would take care that schools should be provided in sufficient abundance to accommodate that number. So much stress has been laid on the supposed sufficiency of accommodation, that it is fair to assume that the promoters of the “Manchester” scheme are not sanguine as to any increased voluntary efforts for supplying any want that may arise; and if, on analysing our statistics, any great deficiency is apparent, it will no doubt have to be supplied mainly by *rate built schools*. The following table exhibits the town divided into districts, and I believe that no one can dispute the fairness of such a division.

*Division of Manchester and Salford into Districts.*

Name.	Population.	Day Schools only.		Sunday Schools	Total.	One-sixth of the population.	
Factory District.		1 and 2	Poor or Dame.				
Cathedral	23225	396	264	2399	3059	3871	Owing to some little difficulty in dividing these districts exactly, it is thought best to include them together, as the total for the three districts will be found correct.
S. Mark's	4039	400		320	320	673	
S. Luke's	1195	40		90	130	199	
S. Thomas, Red Bank	7223	76	69	460	605	1204	
S. Michael's	21840	30	185	2616	2831	3640	
S. George's	34215	374	420	8630	9424	5702	
S. Barnabas	8453		307	380	687	1409	
S. Philip's	5191		140	429	569	865	
S. Jude's.	13753	176	227	1873	2276	2292	
All Souls.	9585	148	155	665	968	1597	
S. Paul's.	8161	238	125	1281	1644	1360	The 400 scholars under No. 1 and 2 in Cathedral district are Grammar-school boys, who of course come from all districts of the town.
S. Andrew's	16802	798	254	1215	2267	2801	
Harpurhey	2717		40	1325	1365	454	
S. Mary's.	4165		14	200	214	694	
S. Ann's.	2104			475	475	351	
S. James'.	5962	90	49	1702	1841	994	
S. Simon and S. Jude.	4949		24	1634	1658	825	
S. Peter's.	1166	700	25	298	323	195	
S. John's.	14319	231	157	3342	3730	2386	
S. Matthew	12701	73	146	810	1029	2116	
S. Philip's	10392		52	2029	2081	1732	The 700 scholars under No. 1 and 2 in S. Peter's district attend the Mechanics' Institution School.
Trinity.	12486		116	1565	1681	2081	
Christ Church	7013			1912	1912	1169	
S. Bartholomew	8286			647	647	1384	
S. Stephen	9888		152	1500	1652	1646	
S. Matthias	5186		215	950	1165	864	
S. Simon.	6093			790	790	1015	
S. Silas.	8593	1 and 2	Poor or Dame.				The Salford Police Report gives no classification of the qualities of education.
S. Thomas	7183	312	249	1725	1994	1432	
			153	684	1149	1197	
S. George's	28141	729	767	3554	5050	4690	
S. Mark's.	6274	38	163	180	381	1045	
Holy Trinity	19055	115	628	1245	1988	3176	
All Saints.	28628	714	652	3677	5043	4771	
S. Saviour's	6918	484	45	1978	2507	1153	

Under the head of Sunday Schools the number of children attending Day Schools in the same buildings are included with the extra number of children attending on Sunday, ex. gr., S. Ann's school 200 attend in the week, and 275 extra on Sunday; total accommodated, 475.

To estimate the comparative wealth of these various districts it may be stated that the amount expended in relief for the poor is *fully* half as much again in proportion to the population in Manchester and Salford, as it is in Chorlton and Hulme.

In the factory districts of Manchester, for the benefit of which this Bill is professedly introduced, I find only in *three* an excess of school accommodation to balance the deficiency in the remainder; and it cannot be supposed by any one acquainted with the locality that young children, residing in many parts of the town, could attend distant schools.

In the *town* district of Manchester, I find the school accommodation to be in many cases *double* what is necessary, and in only two (one of which, S. Matthew's, is one of the poorest districts in the whole town) is there any deficiency.

In the *out districts* I find generally a superabundance of accommodation, and the deficiency which exists in the Hulme district is accounted for from the fact that the population there has been literally *doubled* during the last ten years.

I find even on the showing of the Manchester and Salford Scheme, that the districts where crime, poverty and ignorance, are most prevalent, are those which require *new* schools, and if a sense of moral responsibility and religious obligation will not induce those who have the means to provide school accommodation now, will a *heavy* rate be any further aid to voluntary exertion?

The general conclusions to be drawn from the foregoing figures taken in connection with the other facts of the case, and the provisions of the Bill, appear to be these:—

1. That the Bill will make the present school accommodation *very insufficient*, by closing many schools, and will therefore necessitate the building of a large number of new schools *out of the Rate*.
2. That by the provisions of the Bill these schools must all be “without creeds,” “without formularies,” “without catechisms.” I add therefore once more “without prayers.”
3. That the *quantity* of Education will not be increased.
4. That the *quality* may possibly be improved in respect of the power of promoting mere intellectual developement, but that there is no ground to expect improvement of any other kind, but the reverse.
5. That the *manner* of bringing the children to school will probably become *compulsory*.
6. That the *matter* of what is taught will be, in the Church schools, not the Catholic Faith, but vague generalities of religion, and even these administered according to every individual's crude fancies, or rejected altogether as an unnecessary part of school teaching.
7. That the Sunday schools, for the support of which no provision is made by the Bill, and which depend altogether upon voluntary efforts, will be severely damaged by the introduction of the principle of a compulsory Rate.

The promoters of the Bill say at times a good deal about its being intended to *encourage and supplement voluntary efforts*, but this cannot be an exact account of the case, because I have it upon the best authority that the words to that effect which appeared originally in the draft of the measure were afterwards struck out, and Mr. Richson's "Sketch," which is the latest manifesto of the party, is of the nature of a declaration of war against all voluntary efforts.

I understand, upon the same authority, 1. that the Roman Catholics will oppose the Bill in its present shape ; 2. that in case it is so altered as to permit their acceptance of it, they would come under Government Inspection, but on no account, and in no instance, under the Corporation.

The following may be cited as an instance of the working of the Bill : in many parts of Manchester there are large districts of very poor population unprovided with school accommodation. Finding a deficiency, the District Committee issue the required notice, that unless the want is supplied in a certain time, they shall proceed to supply it themselves. In many cases, perhaps, funds might be found to hire a room and fit it up, but the Bill only recognises the erection of new schools, such as the Committee of Council approve of, i.e., of the most expensive kind, and therefore it virtually prohibits the occupation of the ground by any religious body. At the expiration of the appointed time, the Committee take possession and proceed, if they have plenty of funds, to build a school, or if it suits their purpose better, *they can take the very room they will not allow us to occupy*, and appropriate the rate to the entire exclusion of religious teaching.

I understand further that the feeling of the Wesleyans is generally against the Bill, with many other of the dissenters, and that it is rare to find any of the leading conductors of Church Sunday schools who lend their support to the measure.

It must not be forgotten, that in the foregoing figures I have been obliged, as an inevitable consequence of the principle of this scheme, to acknowledge all teaching as equally important, and to treat the teaching of the distinctive truths of our religion as an "unfortunate accident," or as an impediment to moral training ; and I have also placed the quality of education given in every school upon a par, and even then I find a deficiency.

By offering a rate to every school, which may be outwardly well conducted, this Bill invites every heterodox kind of teaching to compete against the existing system of Education on religious principles. On the principle of a Government grant, religious bodies are those for whom it is intended, and if any wrong party obtains it, it is by accident. By this Bill, *secular* education is acknowledged alone, and while religious bodies can obtain any benefit only so far as they apply as ordinary schools, every common day school has a powerful weapon put into its hand against schools conducted on religious principles.

## C.

After my "Reply" was sent to the press, I received, by the kind courtesy of Mr. Entwistle, a copy of his "Apology for a Churchman's support of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill."

I should do very ill if I did not take this opportunity of tendering to Mr. Entwistle my best acknowledgments of the tone and temper and spirit in which he has defended what I have felt, and still feel, bound to assail, and to endeavour to overthrow by every legitimate means within my power.

We cannot agree—that I fear is hopeless—but it is a great comfort to feel that our controversy carries with it nothing on either side of bitterness or personal ill-will.

Some of Mr. Entwistle's observations I have anticipated in my "reply." The remainder it must now be my business to deal with as concisely and as conclusively as I can.

I. Mr. Entwistle says that I "confound doctrinal religious truths with formularies."

Now there is no confusion in identifying the doctrines of the Catholic Church of England with the formularies of the Catholic Church of England; as a Churchman I am not concerned with any other "doctrines," and indeed I know of none other in the true and proper sense of the word. If the Church of England possesses the whole Catholic Faith, as I claim for her, then a "doctrine" of any other religious body is only truly and properly "a doctrine" in that it is identical with the doctrine of the Church of England; and, if so, must be truly and properly expressed by the formularies of the Church of England.

I beg, in reference to this point of our controversy, to call attention to the admission, page 4, of Mr. Entwistle's "Apology."

"It is, however, true that in these schools children would not be taught to repeat the formula of any distinctive Faith."

II. I am not responsible for even the qualified identity between my "Outline" and the Manchester and Salford scheme which has been assumed to exist in the Article of the "English Churchman." I repudiate all identity in principle and in detail, and I have shown, both on former occasions and in my present "Reply," what are the grounds on which I repudiate it.

III. I have never professed a desire to see, and I have no desire to see, "*Church schools built out of the public money,*" under any circumstances of any locality; all I have ever asked is aid towards building and making efficient Church schools, provided always that such aid is given without involving one particle of interference, direct or indirect, with the matter or the manner of the teaching and the training given therein. Finding myself a citizen of a country which has, most unhappily for itself, repudiated, to a great extent, Church obedience, I have no choice but to acquiesce in

an arrangement by which the governing body, common to the Church and the Separatists, shall assist each and all, upon a common principle, out of the proceeds of the taxes collected from all.

IV. I am not concerned to defend any laxity which may have existed on the part of the Committee of the National Society in enforcing, so far as in them lies, THE RULE OF THE CHURCH—for it is, not A RULE of the National Society, but, of THE CHURCH—respecting the teaching of the Catechism to all children without exception who are scholars of schools in connection with the Society.

I will simply say here, that if the Committee OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN OF THE POOR IN THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH, shall either abandon the Rule, or allow it to be set aside in any case when it shall be in their power to prevent its being set aside, it will be far better, upon all accounts, that the Society should cease to exist; and if the necessity shall arise—which I do not believe it will—for I believe that the Committee will abide strictly by the Rule, even at the cost of five hundred such measures as the Manchester and Salford scheme, I shall be prepared to do the utmost that is within my power to bring the question to a direct issue.

V. Mr. Entwistle will not expect of me that his approval and that of the Association of which he is so distinguished a member, of the principles and theories and practice of the Committee of Council on Education will tend to our nearer approximation. Looking to the principles and theories, and to far the greater portion of the practice, of the Committee of Council on “Education,” I regard its agency as simply an evil agency. The Committee of Council had a great opportunity of doing good, but it has altogether failed of doing good, for the mere fact of making schools, here and there, more efficient UPON A VICIOUS PRINCIPLE is not *doing good*.

VI. In my sentence, quoted correctly p. 15, of the “Apology,” “that it is not possible for men to care really about the Catholic Faith who are content to admit into the same school with the children of the Church the children of parents who are not of the Church;” the concluding words should have been written simply, “children not of the Church,” meaning thereby children who had not been baptized into the Church. All children so baptized I am ready and glad to admit and to teach and train, as what they really are, i.e. Church children, whatever may be the case with their parents.

VII. I am not sure that I apprehend the full force of Mr. Entwistle’s argument, pp. 15—16.

I do not see my way to distinguishing between—

1. The teacher’s own conscience.
2. The teacher’s duty towards the children belonging to the Church.
3. The consideration of the conscience of the child himself.

I am afraid I must “jumble together” all the three cases, and my answer is this :—

I cannot take *one step* in educating a child who has not either received, or is not, if of such age as to admit of previous teaching, in a definite course of preparation for, holy Baptism, and in the latter case I should not admit the child into the school until holy Baptism had been received.

Every child that has been duly baptized is required by the Church to "learn the Creed, the LORD'S Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and all other things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health," that, so soon as he can say the Creed, the LORD'S Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, *and be further instructed in the Church Catechism set forth for that purpose*, he may be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed by him.

This is THE RULE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, repeated within the four corners of the land many hundred times every day. Mr. Entwistle must excuse me if I hold fast by THE RULE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, and decline, for any consideration whatsoever, to turn either to the right hand or to the left.

VIII. The conscience of a Churchman cannot be bound to what "the Nation may have committed itself to,"—this would be Erastianism "pure and simple."

If "the Nation is already committed to the support of Schools in which no Creed, Catechism, or formulary can be taught," I am sorry for the Nation, but this fact, if it be a fact, can be no reason why a Churchman should assist, or even why he should not denounce, the further extension of a system, and the system itself, which rests upon an absolute negation of the office and commission of THE CHURCH.

IX. Mr. Entwistle is fond of quoting Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools as authorities in these matters. With all respect for Her Majesty's Inspectors, I am disposed to prefer the authority of THE CHURCH.

X. Mr. Entwistle says, "surely there were Christians in the world before the Catechism was written :" granted ; but there were no Christians in the world, before THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST was delivered, and it is THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST which is delivered in the Catechism.

Mr. Entwistle says again, " Nay I may go much farther, and ask whether there were not Christians before such a formulary as the Apostles' Creed had been heard of ?"

I need not remind Mr. Entwistle that S. Paul speaks in one place of the Christians of his time as having "obeyed from the heart *the form of doctrine* which was delivered unto them," (Romans vi. 17,) and, in another place writes to "Timothy his own son in the Faith," "Hold fast *the form of sound words* which thou hast heard of me in faith and love which is in CHRIST JESUS." (2 Timothy i. 13.)

What DIFFERENCE does Mr. Entwistle conceive to subsist between "the form of doctrine," "the form of sound words," and the Creeds of the Church Catholic ?

## D.

I hope the Editor of the *Manchester Courier* will reconsider his opinion about my "common sense," notwithstanding that I have now to state that, having read and considered Mr. Richson's 113 pages, if anything had been wanting to establish my judgment touching the Manchester and Salford "Education" scheme, it would have been amply supplied by the said 113 pages.

I have often thought the laity of the Church of England hardly used by many of their clergy in this especial particular, that they are encouraged by the example and authority of the said clergy to be lax and indifferent in respect of the Catholic Faith of the Church of England, and are so betrayed into promoting measures which are incompatible with any steady and reasonable adherence to that Faith.

The history of the Manchester and Salford scheme supplies a memorable example of this hard usage.

The ground, upon which this, and all other like schemes, proceed, is "the necessity of the case."

Now there is no ground so easy to be taken, so delusive and so dangerous, as "the necessity of the case."

Those who argue from "the necessity of the case" very commonly build up their theories upon the bare facts of the religious history of a nation, but lose sight of principles.

This particular scheme proceeds upon three "necessities."

Of these the first is undoubtedly *true*.

The second is undoubtedly *false*.

The third is a deduction from the first and second conjointly, and is *worse than false*.

1. The people *must be Educated*—*true*.

2. The people *must be "Educated"* on a national and comprehensive principle—*false*.

3. Wherefore, as such "national and comprehensive" "Education" cannot be had without infringing THE RULES OF THE CHURCH, not simply in respect of those who *are not* of the Church, but also in respect of those who *are of* the Church, the RULES OF THE CHURCH *must be infringed*—*worse than false*.

It is the old story,

Rem facias, rem,

Si possis, recte, si non, quocunque modo, rem.

Now, no sooner had this promising project been set on foot by the "Clerk in orders of the Cathedral Church of Manchester," than there arrive two higher ecclesiastical functionaries to help it on.

The first Bishop of Manchester and the "new Dean" are found to be powerful coadjutors.

"Neither his lordship nor the dean appeared to have any very great confidence in voluntary effort as a means of supporting schools: but they both

foresaw that no proposal to provide education out of any public resource could be successful, unless the managers of church schools were prepared to make some concessions in respect to teaching the dogmatic formularies of the Church to children whose parents objected to such instruction.

"Upon the necessity of making such concession, the bishop insisted so perseveringly, that the object he had in view was at the time much misunderstood; and even the promoters of the secular scheme, then gradually increasing in numbers, appear to have indulged some hope that the bishop would join their ranks."—pp. 32, 33, "Sketch, &c."

"Indeed, most persons began to see very clearly that some measure for promoting national education by means of taxation could not be much longer delayed; and hence, in Manchester, the bishop continued to urge upon the Church society the increased importance, under these circumstances, of formally recommending to schools not bound by the rules of the National Society, that they should not insist upon teaching the church formularies to children, whose parents objected to such instruction.

"In this course, the bishop was earnestly supported by the dean; and the consequence was that at a meeting of the committee on March 7th, 1850, it was proposed by the dean, and eventually resolved;—

"That in all Church of England schools, we feel it imperatively our duty to require, that the distinctive teaching of the Church of England should be fully maintained with respect to all those who are in her communion;—but it should in no such schools be obligatory, that the children of parents not being in Church of England communion, receive other direct religious instruction, than that involved in the daily reading of the Holy Scriptures."

"Although this resolution had not been carried without much difficulty, it was soon found to involve more important consequences than most persons had been prepared to believe; inasmuch as it appeared shortly after, that the passing of this resolution by the Church society had removed one of the main impediments to uniting the various religious bodies in a general scheme for promoting education.

"At the same meeting the committee also passed the following resolution;—

"That a memorial be addressed to the Committee of the National Society, praying them to alter or remodel the terms of union, when requested by the managers of any Church school so to do, that parties who have heretofore received the Society's aid on those terms may be enabled to conduct their schools in accordance with the foregoing resolution."

"The memorial here alluded to, was addressed to the National Society, but without any practical results."—pp. 54, 55, "Sketch, &c."

"An incident occurred during the preliminary discussions on this measure, which showed the correct foresight of the bishop and the dean in urging, as preliminary to a general system of education, that provision should be made for exceptional cases of learning the dogmatic formularies of religion. At the private meeting held on the 1st of January (1851), it was proposed, in order to avoid placing an undue constraint on the National Society, in respect to their rule for learning the Church Catechism, that Clause V., s. 2, pt. iii. (Appendix F.) should apply only to schools, which might become chargeable upon the rate for repairs. The scheme was published, however, in the local newspapers as given here in the appendix, and was received with expressions of approval that few

persons were prepared to expect. But when the projected alteration became known, it was met with such decided disapprobation that the promoters of the measure found it necessary to declare immediately their fixed adherence to the scheme as originally proposed. Indeed, it was quite evident that to have adopted any other course would have been ‘simply fatal to the whole measure.’ ” —pp. 68, 69, “Sketch, &c.”

After this exposition of the birth, parentage and education of the Manchester and Salford scheme, it would be very unreasonable to find fault with the lay inhabitants of the two boroughs for any amount of favourable regard which they have bestowed upon it.

But, as I said, I think it hard usage of the laity to expose them after this fashion to the grave charge of dealing with the doctrines of the Catholic Faith as abstractions and unrealities; and the hardship is much aggravated by the consideration that they have been led astray by those very guides whose especial business it is to show them the one true way.

I proceed to comment upon some other passages in Mr. Richson’s “Sketch.”

I. Pages 56, 7, establish the fact that we are indebted for the Manchester and Salford Scheme principally to the efforts made, and the position assumed, by “the National Public Schools Association.” There is no appearance of its being regarded by its promoters as a scheme *good in itself*, but only as one by which they hope to escape “*at least for the present*,”\* from the vigorous and *consistent* efforts of the promoters of purely secular “Education.”

“*Mr. Entwistle’s* experience in Parliament had strongly impressed him with the opinion that no private member, of sufficient influence, could be induced to attempt the introduction of any measure whatever to promote national education; and as Government did not appear prepared for the task, he regarded the difficulties of accomplishing any *general measure* at that time as almost insuperable. But on the other hand, rightly estimating the energy and perseverance of his fellow-townsmen, and knowing how extensively the desire for a national system of education was prevailing among them, he recommended that the application of the present scheme should be limited to Manchester and Salford. Taking into consideration also the local influence of many of the promoters of the National Public Schools Association, *he further advised, that the schools to be built, in case of need, out of the rate should be placed under such management and conducted upon such principles as would probably afford satisfaction to the more moderate of that party; and for this purpose, that the managers of rate-built schools should be exclusively laymen;*† and the use of *Holy Scripture as the basis of religious instruction the only condition absolutely prescribed.*

“In the application of the rate, the author felt himself at liberty to adopt

\* “Sketch,” p. 92.

† I should like to know what Mr. Entwistle and Mr. Richson understand by “laymen.”

the plan of supporting ‘a system of free schools’ which the National Public Schools Association had recommended.”—pp. 66, 67, “Sketch, &c.”

Now, compromises always *begin* with a leaning towards that which, in the judgment, or the fears, of those who compromise, makes the compromise “necessary,” and *end* in its triumph.

It requires no great keenness of vision to see that the promoters of a purely secular “Education,” will not rest satisfied with the advantage they have gained in the propounding of the Manchester and Salford Scheme, much less with its enactment by law: *they will force the matter on to its only natural issue.*

This is what I meant by the sentence which Mr. Entwistle has quoted—that “the Manchester men, *headed by their Bishop*, are doing the work of ‘the National Public Schools Association,’ far more effectually than the Association can, at present, hope to do it for themselves.”

But upon this point, Mr. Richson has, with the most unsuspecting frankness, borne conclusive testimony against his own scheme.

“The promoters of the Public Schools Association may be properly expected to be satisfied, AT LEAST FOR THE PRESENT, with the great work they have accomplished in respect to education.”—p. 92.

II. It appears that the Roman Catholic gentlemen *did not attend* the meeting of Jan 6, 1851, p. 69, and that the Rev. Dr. Errington and the Rev. W. Turner, now Roman Catholic Bishops, withdrew from the Committee after a few attendances.—p. 73.\*

This is very significant of a contrary issue to that predicted, p. 81. “*The Roman Catholics intend to avail themselves fully of the provisions of the measure.*”

I have excellent ground for believing that in the end the Roman Catholics will not touch the measure.

III. Chap. XVII. of the “Sketch” is headed, “some provisions of the measure which have been misunderstood.”

1. The description given of the basis of the measure, p. 76, is vague and exceptional. The only thing really definite about it is the complete subordination to “Government” of the system proposed to be created under the Bill.

I am not concerned to defend or explain the “mistake” that “the measure compels all schools brought under its operation either to adopt some uniform standard of religious teaching, or to exclude from the school-room the teaching of distinctive religious creeds and formularies,” because it is not *my* mistake.

2. With regard to there being “nothing new” in the application of an

\* Vide also Declaration of Roman Catholic Clergy, March 15, 1851, printed in Appendix C. to “the Scheme of Secular Education proposed by the National Public Schools Association, compared with the Manchester and Salford boroughs ‘Education’ Bill.” 1851.

“Education” Rate Mr. Richson must excuse me. The instances he quotes are *all* instances where the ratepayer gets an equivalent for his rate, but I should like to know how people who pay an “Education” Rate, and yet are utterly unable, as I should be myself, to send their children to any one of the schools supported out of the Rate, are to get an equivalent? But who ever heard of people paying a *Rate*, which is a local impost, for a specific purpose, AND GETTING NO EQUIVALENT FOR IT, BUT ONLY WHAT IS, IN THEIR DELIBERATE JUDGMENT, DEEP AND LASTING MISCHIEF TO THEMSELVES AND TO ALL? The *general taxes* are one thing, as I have shown elsewhere; a Rate—or a Tax for a specific purpose, which is much the same impost, except that the latter lacks in some degree the *local* character which attaches to the Rate—is quite another thing.

3. The *responsibility* of the Committee of Council on “Education” is an absolute chimera; from the way in which matters are managed, no body was ever, in a free country, *more purely arbitrary*.

That, however, Mr. Richson should proceed to lay down that “great as is the error which asserts its irresponsibility, much greater is the error which asserts that the local measure confers a vast additional amount of influence upon it,” is a proposition which I did not expect to see hazarded.

Any body who will take the trouble to read the draft of the Bill will see that the whole measure turns upon the sanction and approval of the Committee of Council.

Take the two points of *inspection* and *appeal*, i.e., the two *primary* points.

What are the schools which can be admitted into union under the Bill?

1. Schools open to the inspection of Her Majesty’s Inspectors.
2. Schools open to the inspection of Inspectors to be appointed under this Bill.

Who then are to appoint, and regulate the duties of, these *local* Inspectors?

The Committee of Council. Clause V., sec. 1, 3.

*This is pretty well under the head of inspection.*

Then for *appeal*.

Clause XVI. “*Complaints and appeals* against district Committees or Inspectors to be made to Committee of Council on Education, WHOSE DECISION IS FINAL.”

*This is pretty well under the head of appeal.*

I pass by, as comparatively unimportant, sundry other points in which provision is made by the Bill for extending the influence of the Committee of Council on Education.

4. The point of the power of the Municipal Council and the District School Committee is one which I do not know that I have touched, but what a curious state we must have come to when it is gravely proposed to erect such bodies into THE PROTECTORS OF LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE!—p. 79.

The remaining alleged "mistakes," as far as I am concerned with them, I have disposed of elsewhere.

IV. The only remaining provision of the Bill which it occurs to me to notice here is one very abhorrent from English feelings and habits, but one without which, I suspect, the Bill will altogether fail in increasing the number of school children in Manchester and Salford.

I refer to Clause X., sec. 1, 2.

"X.—Children of persons receiving out-door parochial relief required to attend school.

"1. The clerks of boards of guardians, and of other persons having authority to administer relief to the poor within the school district, to report from time to time to district committee the names of children, between the ages of four and twelve years, resident within the district, who, receiving out-door parochial relief, are not attending school.

"2. Guardians of the poor to require, subject to the rules and regulations of the poor law commissioners, such children to attend school."

I will never believe, till I see it happen, that the good sense and right feeling of the English people will be so far perverted by the crude theories of these disjointed times as to expect any result to accrue from the *compulsory* attendance at school of pauper children, except the destruction of every lingering feeling of independence and the confirmed degradation of the poor.

## E.

*To the Editor of the Guardian.*

Sir,—Will you have the goodness to publish the following letters. I think we need be under no apprehension that the RULE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, therein referred to, will be disturbed or compromised.

Faithfully yours,

GEORGE A. DENISON.

East Brent, Nov. 10, 1851.

## I.

East Brent, Oct. 30, 1851.

My dear Sir,—Will you have the goodness to lay before the Committee of the National Society the subjoined extract from a pamphlet lately published by William Entwistle, Esq., one of the principal promoters of the Manchester and Salford "Education" Scheme, and to convey to the Committee my respectful request that they will take into consideration whether the publication of this passage does not make it necessary for the Committee to declare publicly, without loss of time, that the rule of the National Society therein referred to, viz., that the Catechism of the Church of England shall be taught to all children attending schools in connection with the Society, cannot be rescinded or set aside in any one of such schools with the concurrence of the Committee.

The proposed measure for Manchester and Salford founded upon an education rate is exciting great and general alarm—an alarm not likely to be diminished by the admission so distinctly made by Mr. Entwistle, that the measure can only succeed through the sacrifice of the rule of the National Society.

It will therefore be of the utmost service, and of great comfort to many minds, to know that the Committee of the National Society do not concur in Mr. Entwistle's judgment of the duty of the Church of England in this great matter.

I beg to add that I propose to publish this letter together with any reply with which I may be honoured by the Committee.

Believe me, my dear Sir, very faithfully yours,  
 (Signed)                   GEORGE A. DENISON.

The Rev. the Secretary of the National Society.

*Extract from an "Apology for a Churchman's Support of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill. By W. Entwistle. 'These are the schools which Churchmen are combining with all denominations to create.'—Preface to Two Sermons, by the Rev. G. A. Denison. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. Manchester: Simms and Dinharn."*

"I fully admit that the National Society had a right to prescribe its own terms, and that those who accepted the aid are bound by the terms; but I claim on behalf of our association an equal right to lay down the terms on which alone they will give their consent and aid in the passing of a bill for rating property to support national education. I will at once put the argument against us in what I believe to be its strongest form, viz. that if the National Society shall refuse to rescind its rule, or even to allow of its suspension in the case of schools wholly supported by payment out of the rate, our scheme would fail in its main object, that of rendering all, or nearly all, existing schools free to all the population.

"We place before the National Society the strongest inducement to reconsider their decision under a new state of things, and shall be indeed disappointed if we find that the enforcement of the contract renders it impossible for managers of schools connected with the National Society to accept the aid which this measure tenders for their maintenance. It would not be too much to say that from the vast number of schools which have received the Society's aid, and are therefore bound by their terms, the bill which we promote would be a failure without their concurrence. But I hope a better result. While full liberty will be reserved to every Church minister and teacher to impart to those pupils *who belong to that Church* 'all the Articles of the Christian faith' as held by themselves, and comprised in the formularies recognised by the Church, I cannot believe that so great a boon as that now offered will be rejected, in order to keep alive a nominal right to enforce the learning of the Church Catechism upon all the children attending a Church school, whether they belong to the Church or not."

## II.

National Society's office, Sanctuary, Westminster, Oct. 31, 1851.

My dear Sir,—I have duly received your letter of yesterday's date, with the extract from Mr. Entwistle's pamphlet appended thereto; and I will lay it before the Committee of this Society at the earliest opportunity.

I am, dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

(Signed) JOHN G. LONSDALE, Secretary.

The Ven. Archdeacon Denison.

## III.

National Society's office, Sanctuary, Westminster, Nov. 6, 1851.

My dear Sir,—I have submitted to the Committee of this Society your letter of the 30th ult., together with the extract from Mr. Entwistle's pamphlet appended thereto.

I am desired by the Committee to state that, having duly considered that extract, and the request preferred to them by yourself, they do not feel called upon to make any declaration upon the rule of the Society to which your letter refers.

Believe me, dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

(Signed) JOHN G. LONSDALE, Secretary.

The Ven. Archdeacon Denison.

## F.

## THE GIRDLESTONE AGITATION.

I beg to state, for the information of Members of the National Society, in reference to the Circular and Memorial of Mr. Girdlestone and his friends, which is now before the public, that I shall be prepared, if GOD spare my life, to offer to every attempt based upon the principles set forth in those documents, and under every aspect in which such attempt shall present itself, a steady and uncompromising opposition.

If Mr. Girdlestone and his friends shall be allowed to succeed in any measure or degree, or to have ground to imagine that they have succeeded, it can only be, *as was the case this year*, through *our* indecision and infirmity of purpose. Such success, or imagined success, is therefore certainly *possible*, but I cannot think that it is at all *probable*.

Measures will of course be taken to secure, at the next annual meeting, A REAL VOTE upon the propositions submitted to the meeting.

It is worse than useless to attempt to disguise, or to extenuate, THE DIFFERENCE OF PRINCIPLE which exists between the National Society, as Incorporated by Royal Charter, and the Committee of Council on

“ Education.” The attempt to introduce amongst us the principle of an “ Education ” Rate, under the auspices, and in subservience to the agencies, of the Committee of Council ; the connexion now avowed to be *necessary*, between the success of the scheme proposed to be based upon an “ Education ” Rate, and the setting aside, and assigning a *secondary* place to, the Church Catechism, and generally, to the dogmatic teaching of the Church in Church schools ; these things must, I think, have already sufficed to open the eyes of those who have, hitherto, most refused to see.

Up to the present time, the Committee of Council has prevailed. They have encountered no steady and consistent opposition except from individuals, and their success has been therefore great. The principles of the National Society, which are the principles of the Church of England, have been set aside or compromised through the operation of the Management Clauses, and from various unhappy causes, the great Educational Society of the Church is in imminent danger of sinking rapidly into a branch agency of the Council office. This fall of the National Society would have resulted from the simple continuance of the existing relations between the two bodies, and it is therefore that I have laboured, but hitherto without success, to get those relations altered and amended.

I am thankful for the Church’s sake, that Mr. Girdlestone and his friends have decided to bring the matter to a direct issue. It must, now at least, be sufficiently plain how great a mistake was made in adopting the “ do nothing ” policy, suggested at the late annual meeting, and that nothing short of a like determination on our side to bring the matter to a direct issue can avail to save THE NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE EDUCATION OF THE POOR IN THE PRINCIPLES OF THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH THROUGHOUT ENGLAND AND WALES.









